

Daily
Nebraskan
Editorial Board
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Jeremy Fitzpatrick Editor, 472-1766
Rainbow Rowell Opinion Page Editor
Adeana Leftin Managing Editor
Todd Cooper Sports Editor
Jeff Zeleny Associate News Editor
Sarah Duey Arts & Entertainment Editor
William Lauer Senior Photographer

EDITORIAL

Time to talk

CBA climate should be dealt with openly

Memo to Gary Schwendiman, dean of the College of Business Administration: Put away your memo pad. The UNL chapter of the American Association of University Professors issued a report in January describing the climate in CBA as chilly for women. Schwendiman responded to the report with internal CBA memos, which have not helped to solve the problem.

There are conflicting reports about the atmosphere in the college. Female faculty members have been unwilling to come forward and publicly complain about the college.

But, the AAUP cited women from CBA in its report. Helen Moore, chairwoman of the Sociology Department, conducted the report. Moore said female faculty members and students made complaints, but did not disclose their names "for fear of retribution."

Schwendiman responded with an internal memo that said the report was "the result of a strategy developed by an off-campus group called the Nebraska Women's Political Network." Schwendiman said the plot to disrupt the college was designed several months ago.

Sue Ellen Wall, a member of the Nebraska Women's Political Network, called the charges ludicrous.

Only the women in CBA can say for sure what the climate in CBA is like for them. But the fact that any woman is upset about the environment she works in is a problem.

The answer to the AAUP report is not writing memos that attempt to ignore the issue. Schwendiman should put away his memo pad and deal with the issue openly, so it can be resolved.

Providing a friendly atmosphere where the AAUP report can be discussed cannot hurt CBA. It might encourage women, who were reluctant to speak before, to come forward.

Social Insecurity

Cap would punish children, not offenders

Because of suspected fraud, the Social Security Administration may cap cash assistance to children with disabilities.

The administration believes that families may be coaching children to misbehave or act "crazy." The cap would limit the amount of Supplemental Security Income one family could receive.

This sort of cap would punish the people SSI is supposed to help. Although there may be some fraud since the Supreme Court made it easier to qualify for assistance in 1990, the children who qualify for assistance do so for a reason. Their families need help.

If there is fraud, then the administration should concentrate on punishing offenders or making more accurate tests for qualification.

If a family has two children with disabilities, then the family should receive more assistance. Because many disabilities run in families, this is possible. Children with disabilities often need expensive medical treatment their families may not be able to afford.

Children of these families should not suffer because of someone else's dishonesty.

We must expect any welfare program to be abused to some extent. But we shouldn't allow our frustration with this dishonesty to cloud the purpose of these programs.

Capping SSI to children with disabilities won't save much money. It may end fraud, but it will hurt children who already face far too many challenges.

EDITORIAL POLICY

Staff editorials represent the official policy of the Spring 1994 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the university, its employees, the students or the NU Board of Regents. Editorial columns represent the opinion of the author. The regents publish the Daily Nebraskan. They establish the UNL Publications Board to supervise the daily production of the paper. According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its students.

LETTER POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers and interested others. Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject all material submitted. Readers also are welcome to submit material as guest opinions. The editor decides whether material should run as a guest opinion. Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be published. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted. Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.

MEHSLING
©1994



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Business discrimination

While gathering my books to study the other day, I glanced down at the front page of the Feb. 21 DN. The headline read, "Spanier: CBA sexism charges questionable."

Spanier said letters from women telling of positive experiences in the College of Business Administration led him to this evaluation.

"I can only conclude from these letters that the majority of women in the college were not consulted in the preparation of the report and do not feel the report accurately reflects their sentiments," he said.

Hmmmm I mused, I'm a CBA student, and nobody asked me what I thought.

Opening my Management 360 textbook, "Organizational Behavior," I began to read Chapter 4 on "Personality." The introduction on Page 83 listed 10 traits of winning managers, according to recruiters. I felt comfortable until I got to No. 8, which says winners are "willing to pay the price to get there."

Yeah, I thought, but the prices are usually set by men who can afford to invest more than women because they don't bear children or iron their own shirts. Besides, women are less motivated by material rewards than men.

I read on, but Item No. 10 stopped me cold. "They liked competitive sports."

This is a description of a male, I thought. These recruiters' profile of a winner is a male. Feeling bruised, I read on. The last sentence on Page 83 reads, "A workaholic who wins loyalty and results."

Don't these people know that workaholicism, which they hold up as a desirable trait, is an illness, a disease?

On to Page 84. "Has unbelievable energy and Boy Scout ethics. Keen mind, intuitive but also strong numbers man."

At this point I was numb, in disbelief that I had to pay for the book as a required course text, and wondering what year it was written.

Checking the publication date, I saw it was first published in 1973. My God, I thought, that was the year before I first went to college.

Could it be possible that all University of Nebraska-Lincoln classes since 1973 had been spoon-fed this bigotry?

The book I had was the sixth edition, last revised in 1992. This man is socially unconscious, I thought.

If he had never felt compelled to remove such offensive material in all these 21 years since he wrote it, he must be socially comatose.

Who wrote this book, I wondered, and where was he from?

There it was on the title page, in black and white: Fred Luthans, George

Holmes Professor of Management, University of Nebraska.

At this point, totally disillusioned, I closed the book and put it aside, thinking that any other useful information that might be in the textbook had been nullified. A lovely cup of tea with only a little arsenic is still deadly.

My message to Dr. Luthans — thank you for revising your seventh edition.

My message to Dr. Spanier — there is no room for defensiveness in business.

My message to women in CBA and all women everywhere — the fastest way to end a game is to expose the players. Every woman on earth pays for your silence through economic discrimination and hobbled personal empowerment.

Remember the gauntlet thrown down by Susan B. Anthony in 1863: "Forget conventionalism; forget what the world will say, whether you are in your place or out of your place; think your best thoughts, speak your best words, do your best works, looking (only) to your own conscience for approval."

Lavonne Juhl
senior
business



James Meshling/DN

'Little buggers'

Regarding Paul Koester's column on prairie dogs (DN, Feb. 28, 1994), what was his point?

Sure people are killing the little buggers, but so what? Has he ever seen what a rancher has to put up with? Does he even care? Probably not. I have read several of his articles, and I know that he sees no need for farming and ranching.

He thinks it's barbaric and inconsiderate to our environment — that we should turn the animals loose and not

touch the land anymore. There's a slight problem with this. How does he plan on feeding the people on this planet?

He is probably blessed with the ignorance of not knowing where the food at Super Saver comes from.

I'll give him a hint: farms and ranches. Show me a meal and I'll guarantee it came from some type of farm or ranch.

Please stop trying to put a guilt trip on farmers and ranchers like me. I have to work hard enough to put food on the table for people like you, without getting kicked in the teeth for doing it. When Koester wakes up in the morning, instead of thinking of ways to put down farmers and ranchers, he should try thinking of ways to thank them for keeping him alive. Whether he likes it or not, he would be worm food if it wasn't for the farmer or rancher.

We are doing the best we can to protect the environment. We strive to protect our environment because it is in our best interest to do so.

Before we save the overpopulated prairie dog, why don't we start saving endangered species like the family farmer?

Unless Koester comes up with some type of possible solution, I will resort to shooting the little buggers and protecting my livelihood.

Kerry Maline
sophomore
agribusiness
assistant manager for Maline Farms

Minority rights

Regarding Matthew Wegener's letter (DN, Feb. 24, 1994), what country is Wegener from? He wrote, "in this country, majority rules ... and you have no so-called minority rights." He could not be referring to the United States, where the Constitution guarantees the rights of both majority and minority.

The civil rights battles of the 1950s and the '60s were about this. Does anyone think it was acceptable when one group, whites, could tell another group, blacks, that they couldn't vote? Majority ruled, didn't it?

Just because 90 percent of people are not of a group — in this case, homosexuals — does not make the 10 percent "disgusting and animalistic."

If we used such mathematics to decide moral issues, we would have to say that members of celibate religious orders are equally morally deficient because they too violate the norm.

Wegener shouldn't confuse statistics with moral arguments, or he may find himself in a minority without rights.

Trevor McArthur
senior
teachers college